

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Darrell Williams, #219730,

Civil Action No. 2:21-cv-155-CMC

Plaintiff,

vs.

Alan Wilson, South Carolina Attorney  
General,

Defendant.

**ORDER**

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's Complaint filed January 14, 2021. ECF No.

1. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker for pre-trial proceedings.

On April 8, 2021, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report and Recommendation ("Report") recommending this matter be summarily dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process because Plaintiff could not cure the jurisdictional defects in his Complaint. ECF No. 8. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff filed a motion for extension of time to file objections until May 7, 2021, which the court granted. However, that deadline has expired and Plaintiff has not filed objections.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made

by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.”) (citation omitted).

After a review of the record, the applicable law, and the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court finds no clear error, and agrees this matter should be dismissed. Plaintiff cannot utilize this § 1983 action to bring this attack on a state court judgment, and Defendant Wilson is not liable under § 1983. Accordingly, the court adopts the Report by reference in this Order. This matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina  
May 20, 2021